

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2004 (Paper No. 13). Claims 1-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 24, and 33 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 8, 10 to 13, 24 to 27 and 29 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,236 (Sherman); Claims 4, 5, 9, 14 to 19, 28, 33 to 36 and 46 to 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sherman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,287 (Diepstraten); and Claims 37 to 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sherman and Diepstraten in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,609 (Nago). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention generally concerns a communication station that is adapted to communicate with other such stations when at least one of the communication stations supplies a synchronisation signal. The station that supplies the synchronisation signal then functions in base station mode wherein the stations not supplying a synchronisation signal synchronise on the synchronisation signal and then function in mobile station mode. According to one feature of the invention, a mobile station receives a request from a first base station for transmission by the mobile station of a message to a communication station which is not synchronised with the first base station.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of communicating between communication stations adapted to communicate with each other when at least one of the communication stations supplies a synchronisation signal, the station then functioning in base station mode and the stations not supplying a

synchronisation signal but synchronising on a synchronisation signal sent by a station functioning in base station mode then functioning in mobile station mode. The method includes a request operation during which a first base station transmits, to a mobile station, a request for the storage in memory and transmission, by the mobile station, of a message to a communication station for which the message is intended and which is not synchronised with the first base station.

In a similar manner, independent Claim 24 is directed to a device.

Independent Claim 14 is directed to a method of communicating between communication stations adapted to communicate with each other when at least one of the communication stations supplies a synchronisation signal, the station then functioning in base station mode and the stations not supplying a synchronisation signal but synchronising on a synchronisation signal sent by a station functioning in base station mode then functioning in mobile station mode. The method includes a first operation of receiving a message, during which a mobile station synchronised with a first base station receives a message coming from the first base station, and an operation of detachment and attachment, during which the mobile station synchronises with a second base station, without the two base stations synchronising with each other. The method also includes a second transmission operation, during which the mobile station transmits the message to the second base station.

In a similar manner, independent Claim 33 is directed to a device.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, the Sherman, Diepstraten and Nago patents are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a mobile station receiving a message from a first

base station for transmission by the mobile station to a communication station which is not synchronised with the first base station.

As understood by Applicants, Sherman describes that a new integrated communication network is consolidated from a plurality of smaller sub-networks, each having their respective central destination communication nodes, and a plurality of remote communication nodes. The sub-networks can operate each at different radio frequencies. Each communication node in a sub-network can communicate with other communication nodes in the same sub-network including the central communication node of the sub-network at its own radio frequency. The central communication nodes only, have "frequency agile" transceivers capable of transmitting and receiving DMG's at the sub-network's frequency and a master network frequency. See Sherman, column 18, lines 40 to 66.

Although Sherman discloses an integrated network consolidated from a plurality of smaller networks, it is not seen to disclose or suggest that a mobile station (or remote communication mode) receives a message from a first base station (or central communication node) for transmission by the mobile station to a communication station which is not synchronised with the first base station.

The Office Action cites to column 19, lines 10 to 18, which indicates that messages between an originating node of one network to a destination node in another network are routed to that sub-network's central transceiver at the originating node sub-network's frequency, then to the central transceiver of the destination node's sub-network at the master network frequency, and finally to the final destination node in the second sub-network at that network frequency. Although the central transceivers act as repeaters, or

stations that receive and re-transmit messages, a mobile station within the sub-network does not act as a repeater, since it does not receive and transmit messages. See Sherman, column 17, lines 66 to 67. In contrast, the mobile station of the present invention does receive a message and transmits it to another communication station.

In addition to this deficiency, the destination communication system of the present invention is not synchronised with the first base station. Sherman is not seen to disclose whether the destination communication system is synchronised with the first base station.

Diepstraten and Nago have also been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Sherman.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 14, 24, and 33 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 83053v1